# Testimony From Victims of Telephone Duplication

BOUT 1,200 letters received by the Merchants' Association of New York from business men in cities having two telephone systems have been filed with the Comptroller of the City.

A very large majority state that their annual outlay for telephone service has considerably increased, and the use of both systems by business men is compulsory. Other objections stated are: Inconvenience of consulting two directories, of having two telephones on the desk, and of answering two rings at once; the impossibility of communication between the exclusive users of rival systems; and the damage to and obstruction of streets.

The only benefits claimed are improved service in those cities where the service was formerly bad and an increase in the number of telephone users. These claims have no pertinence to New York, whose telephone service is already the best in the world, and whose telephone development exceeds that of all other cities of the first class.

The following extracts from some of these letters demonstrate conclusively that

## Telephone Duplication Means Double Expense and Inferior Service.

#### ATLANTA, GA.

LAMAR AND RANKIN DRUG STORE COMPANY, Wholesale Druggists: We ago two telephone companies in our city, and find it a nuisance instead of a benefit ROBERT F. MADDOX, Vice-President MADDOX-RUCKER BANKING COM-PANY: Second company is in no way a benefit. It forced nearly all business houses to subscribe to two 'phones. To the interest of any city to have one well-operated company rather than two systems.

ATLANTA NATIONAL BANK, by Charles E. Currier, President: Would infinitely prefer a single telephone system, are afflicted with two systems, costing double what at would under one management, and with poorer results.

ATLANTA SUPPLY COMPANY, Cotton Mill Supplies: Two lines of telephones are a nulsanse as well as an expense.

FOURTH NATIONAL BANK, by FOURTH NATIONAL BANK, by Sharles I, Ryan, Asst Cashler: It is necestary for all business houses to take both elephones, which imposes financial hard-hilp upon the business public without any compensating advantage in return.

BECK & GREGG HARWARE COMPANY, Wholesale Hardware: In plain full state of the property of the proper

FULTON BAG AND COTTON MILLS: Has increased our expense, because the fates of the first company were never lowered, and therefore what we pay for the second system is merely an additional expense. Further, there is a great deal more work to attend to two systems. KEELY COMPANY, Deparement Store: Competition has increased our outlay for elephone service about 30 per cent, with no appreciable improvement in the same. COL. ROBERT LOWRY, President Lowry National Bank: Two systems are really a nulsance and needless expense.

## ALBANY, N. Y.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE: Competi

BALTIMORE, MD. CARROLL ADAMS & CO., Boots and ed to sell out to the old commany was form-ed to sell out to the old commany. IT HAS NOT KEPT ITS AGREEMENT MADE AT THE TIME THE CHARTER WAS ASKED FOR AS REGARDS PRICES AT WHICH SERVICE IS FURNISHED. SERVICE IS CURNISHED.

HAMBLETON & COMPANY, Bankers:
Resarding as we do that this public utility
is in the nature of a natural monopoly, we
do not consider competition destrable, as
the effect on prices is only temporary. In
this case, the cost of the two systems of
tects little or noching in the way of seying, and the ultimate result will be conkolidation, for which the public will have to
pay. DAVIDSON CHEMICAL COMPANY, Sulphuric Acid: Competition has increased our annual outlay, as we have to nay two companies. We see no advantage in having two companies. We doubt if the new company has beloed in lowering rates.

SAFE DEPOSIT AND TRUST COMPANY OF BALTIMORE: The installation of two telephone services has, of course, increased our cuttary certainly as much as 40 per cem. for telephone services we think that two telephone services are a hindrance rather than a help besides adding to the expense. hindrance rather than a help, besides adding to the expense.

GILES W. QUARLES, Importer of China and Glass. Competition has increased annual outlar to nearly double, because we are forced to have two telephones.

THE AMERICAN LABEL MANUFACTURING COMPANY: If reasonable service is being given by one company, commetition is more at the expense of the customers, because it forces a firm that might get along with one telephone to have two.

GRAY & DUDLEY HARDWARE COMPANY: We do not find any advantage in naving two telephone systems, but, on the other hand, find a great many disadvantages it is necessary for all business houses to install both telephone systems, which means double expense and double trouble, without better results.

CRANE COMPANY, Manufacturers of Wrought Pipe; Very undestrable to the subscribers. All subscribers are compelled to have two obnoses. This makes confusion, and increases the cost. We would much prefer one telephone, and regard it as an infliction on any community to have two telephones.

#### BUFFALO, N. Y.

PRATT & LETCHWORTH COMPANY. Buffulo Malleable Iron & Steel Works: We have as yet failed to derive any special benefit brought about by the introduction of a competitive telephone system here. About the only thing we have been able to detect is additional expense of being obliged to install both 'bhones.

THE J. M. MATTHEWS COMPANY. Newspaper and Printung: We are subscribers to both telephone systems because the situation seemed to demand it, so in a way we were forced. Competition has increased the annual outlay 6) per cent. We consider two competing systems very undesirable. One good system reaching all subscribers is far preferable.

HAINES LUMBER COMPANY: Dupilicates the service in the office and is often a nuisance when simultaneous calls come in for the same individual.

ACME STEEL AND MALLEABLE PRATT & LETCHWORTH COMPANY.

also inconvenient.

J. N. ADAM CO.: Our total annual out-lay has been considerably increased. The former service was good, and competition has not improved it. One good system is better, cheaper and more convenient than two.

and they should be compelled to furnish Thomes at reasonally rates.

BARLIONS & OLIVER, Tyrret Machinery: Competition has increased the amount of our annual outlay. It is out of the question to have two branch exchanges. In practice we find that we get calls on the Cuyanoga when the person wanted is in distant parts of the factory. The same applies to the desks in the office. One telephone on a desk is preferable to two. We believe in competition in most things, but not in the telephone business.

GEORGE WORTHINGTON COMPANY, Hardware: We are compelled to subscribe to both companies. We are paying possibly 60 per cent more by reason of having two companies.

Pills. NER BREWING COMPANY: Has

to both compunies. We are paying possibly 60 per cent more by reason of having two companies.

Pilsuner Brewing Company: Has increased the cost considerably. Two companing systems very undescrable, because waere one answered our purpose before, we need two, and while the expense is almost double, the service on the new line is very poor.

HART & COMPANY, Straw Goods: We are compelled to have both systems at a great increase in cost. We have both in our offices, and also have a private branch exchange under the Bell system, with many stations in our various departments on the several floors of our building. If a call comes over the Cuyahoga 'phone for any one in the house, we are compelled to send from the office to a distant part of the building to bring the party called for to the 'phone, and have the wire held until he reaches the 'phone. The slernative is that we must pay several hundred dollars a year more to install a second private branch exchange. The Cuyahoga Company was organized and obtained subscribers on the promise of reducing telepione costs, claiming that the Bell rates were exorbitant. The Cuyahoga Company has not brought about a reduction of Bell rates, but, on the contrarty, has largely increased its original rates until they are now almost as large as those charged by the Bell Company, which it formerly denounced as exorbitant. We are distinctly agains competition, not only on account of the greatly increased expense to large houses like ours, but because two systems are a great annoyance.

## COLUMBUS, O.

BEALL-LIVINGSTONE COM-

#### DETROIT, MICH.

SMITH PREMIER TYPEWRITER COMPANY: Competition has increased annual outlay. We do not find any particular benefit by using two telephones.

ALEX. Y. MALCOLMSON, Coal: There is only one system in the city at present. A few years ago we had two systems, which worked to a disadvantage of the patrons, for the reason that the combined rates were greater and the service much more unsatisfactory transhem as companions of the patrons o

#### GRAND RAPIDS, MICH. ORIEL CABINET COMPANY We have

other carrier company we have both extens, as it is commissive. It is usually of no aluminare to have two telephones, if one will elve the proper service. Two means more trouble, more expense, and more inconvenience in a general way. CHARLES TRANKIA & COMPANY. Dry Goods: Annual outlay increased about 50 per cent. We believe a town of 100 cm est along very well and better with one exchange. WORMNEST STOVE AND RANGE COMPANY: It is a perfect nulsame to have two systems. One system used universally would make the ideal system. RIANGMAN'S SAMPLE FURNITURE, COMPANY: Two companies are undestrible for any locality. If you have two in a house and they are located near together it is very hard to tell which is ringing. FULLER & RICE LUMBER & MFG.
CO.; Annual outlay increased. Commetition
extremely undesirable on account of extra
expense and extra bother. Keep out of it,
if you can. MACEY-WERNICKE COMPANY, LTD.: The double telephone system, from our standpoint, is not santstactory, and when the necessity of two instruments and a complete double service is taken into constileration, the cost is quite black. JULISON GROCERY COMPANY: It is disagreeable and unnecessary to have two telephones in any city. Unfortunately we have two in Grand Rapids. Two telephones stars me in the face all the timeone is enough. JOHN WAHL. Confections: We have to have both phones. It would be better to have only one.

#### INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

VAN CAMP PACKING CO.: Annual ex-

## KANSAS CITY, MO.

KANSAS CITY STAR: Has nearly doubled the cost of service. Competition is highly undesirable and a source of incessant bother.

## LOUISV'L' E, KY.

LOUISVILLE BOARD OF TRADE, by John F. Buttner, Secretary It forces every house of consequence to use both whether, they want to or not.

NATIONAL BANK OF KENTUCKY: CITIZENS' NATIONAL BANK: We have been unable to discover any advantage to be derived from having two telephone systems in our town. It has resulted in additional expense of from 100 to 150 per cent. per year without any compensating advantage.

COURIER-JOURNAL PRINTING COMPANY: Competition has not decreased the amount of our annual outlay. If there is any greater nuisance that two lets.

BOARD OF TRADE. We have noth aya-

# ARBUTHNOT - STEPHENSON COM-PANY, Wholesale Dry Goods: Competition has not bettered our system or decreased

ATLANTIC REFINING CO., Oll: Annual utlay has been increased. If at a furental, it is my opinion that one system tion is undestrable.

STANDARD SANITARY MFG, COMPANY: We were compelled to but in the
omoestion. Summing it up, an opposition
commany simply adds to the expense of
the larger comanies doing business. A, & S. WILSON CO. Contractors: Com-position has increased our jelephone expense about 351-3 per cent. Two companies are not desirable.

M. D. KNOWLTON CO. Paper Box Ma-chinery: Two 'phones are a bother and should never be allowed in any city. Noth-ing is gained. STEIN MFG. CO.: Annual outlay in-creased to a large extent. It is a perfect nulsance to have two telephones in an

WEAVER, PALMER & RICHMOND, Wholesale Hardware: The firm has both telephone systems because they cannot avoid it, and the several members of the firm have both in their houses, in order that they raw talk to their friends who have one or the other system. Two systems simply double the expense and are an unmiligated nuisance. If you have one good system you should not consider for a moment putting in another.

#### ST. LOUIS, MO.

N. O. NELSON MFG. CO., Bathtubs: No dvantage in two separate systems. Would need prefer to have just one system. there has been no reduction in the cost the service, neither do we think that

h telephones—a kind of hold-up, butlay increased \$50. We see no do all the husiness.

THE HERZOG IRON WORKS: Competition has increased our annual outlay.
One system being cheaper than two, is, of course, more desirable, provided the management is up-to-date as well as the

## TOLEDO, O.

CHENEY MEDICINE CO.: Annual outlay doubled. There is absolutely no excuse for more than one system. THE NEW COMPANY VIOLATED ITS FRANCHISE BY RAISING RATES AND HAS DEEN SUSTAINED BY THE SUPREME COURT. Outlay doubled as well as the annoyance. Any town that has one up-to-date telephone system is for unate, especially if the rates are reas nable. THE LION DRY GOODS CO.: Annual outlay increased without marked improvement. Two competing systems are undesirable because of increased cost. One good system with fair rates is far preferable.

W. A. GOSLINE & CO., Coal Operators: Power but one system.

POWHATAN FUEL CO.: Our annual outlay is nearly doubled, and the service made much more inconvenient. Two systems are an unmitigated nuisance.

B. D. CARR, President National Bank of Commerce: Merchants generally must have both telephone systems, and their outlay is necessarily increased. If you have one good system, you are much better off than with two competing systems.

Hon. Martin W. Littleton, Counsel for The Atlantic Telephone Company, says. "The majority of the business concerns using telephones of the existing Company would, of course, be compelled to install our telephones in addition."

- New York Times, May 3d, 1906.